SCIENTIFIC, PROFESSIONAL, AND ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS TO PROMOTE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 25 1956

MAIN
READING ROOM

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. R. 11040

A BILL TO CREATE ADDITIONAL SCIENTIFIC, PROFESSIONAL, AND ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS TO PROMOTE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

MAY 10 AND 11, 1956

Printed for the use of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
78737 WASHINGTON : 1956

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

TOM MURRAY, Tennessee, *Chairman*

JAMES H. MORRISON, Louisiana
JAMES C. DAVIS, Georgia
GEORGE M. RHODES, Pennsylvania
JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Michigan
JOHN DOWDY, Texas
HUGH Q. ALEXANDER, North Carolina
JOHN E. MOSS, JR., California
EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR., Virginia
GRACIE PFOST, Idaho
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
T. JAMES TUMULTY, New Jersey
JOE M. KILGORE, Texas
CHET HOLIFIELD, California

EDWARD H. REES, Kansas
ROBERT J. CORBETT, Pennsylvania
KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, New York
H. R. GROSS, Iowa
CECIL M. HARDEN, Indiana
ALBERT W. CRETELLA, Connecticut
CHARLES S. GUBSER, California
JOEL T. BROYHILL, Virginia
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, Michigan
JOHN E. HENDERSON, Ohio
AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Michigan

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page
Astin, Dr. A. V., Director, National Bureau of Standards	17
Barley, Frank J., Director, Bureau of Inspections and Classification Audits, Civil Service Commission	24
Beasley, Otis, Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior	4
Hayward, Dr. Carlton W., Director, Office of Personnel Management, Department of Commerce	12
Macy, John W., Jr., Executive Director, Civil Service Commission	37, 41
Miller, Thomas, Acting Director, Bureau of Mines	9
Moore, Hon. George M., Commissioner, Civil Service Commission	27, 39
Nolan, Dr. Thomas B., Director, Geological Survey	7
Reichelderfer, Dr. Francis W., Chief, Weather Bureau	18
Young, Hon. Philip, Chairman, Civil Service Commission	24, 31

SCIENTIFIC, PROFESSIONAL, AND ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS TO PROMOTE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1956

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a. m., in room 213, Old House Office Building, Hon. Tom Murray (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

This morning the House is meeting an hour earlier than usual and an effort will be made to expedite the business of the committee.

The first item of business this morning is consideration of H. R. 11040, a bill to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes.

(Bill H. R. 11040 follows:)

[H. R. 11040, 84th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsections (a) and (b) of the first section of the Act of August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 715; Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress), as amended, are amended to read as follows: "(a) the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than two hundred and seventy-five positions in the Department of Defense and not more than fifty positions in the National Security Agency, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, as the case may be, which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

"(b) The Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, not to exceed sixty positions in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established in order to enable the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to secure and retain the services of specially qualified personnel necessary in the discharge of the duty of the Committee to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution.

"(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed ten positions of a professional or scientific nature in the Department of the Interior, each such position being established in order to enable the Department of the Interior to effectuate those research and development functions and activities of such Department which require the services of specially qualified professional or scientific personnel.

"(d) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed thirty-five positions of a professional or scientific nature in the Department of Commerce, each such position being established in order to enable the Department of Commerce to effectuate those research and development functions and activities of such department which require the services of specially qualified professional or scientific personnel."

(b) Nothing contained in the amendment made to such Act of August 1, 1947, by subsection (a) of this section shall affect any position existing under authority of subsection (a) of the first section of such Act of August 1, 1947, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of such amendment, the compensation attached to any such position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his right to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken under authority of subsection (a) of such first section of such Act of August 1, 1947, as contained in the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Subsection (c) of the first section of such Act of August 1, 1947, as amended, is hereby redesignated subsection (e) of such first section.

(d) Section 3 of such Act of August 1, 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Each officer, with respect to positions established by him under this Act, shall submit to the Congress, not later than February 1 of each year, a report which sets forth—

"(1) the number of such positions so established or in existence during the immediately preceding calendar year,

"(2) the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent of each such position, together with the position title and a statement of the functions, duties, and responsibilities performed by each such incumbent, except that nothing contained in this section shall require the resubmission of information required under this paragraph which has been reported pursuant to this section and which remains unchanged, and

"(3) such other information as he deems appropriate.

"(b) In any instance in which any officer so required to submit such report may consider full public disclosure of any or all of the above-specified items to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest, such officer is authorized—

"(1) to omit in his annual report those items with respect to which full public disclosure is considered by him to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest,

"(2) to inform the Congress of such omission, and

"(3) at the request of any congressional committee to which such report is referred, to present information concerning such items in executive sessions of such committee."

SEC. 2. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 179; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1105), is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (b) of such section 505 "subsections (c), (d), and (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f)" and

(2) by adding at the end of such section 505 the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in accordance with the standards and procedures of this Act, to place a total of two hundred and eighty-five positions in the Department of Defense in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b)."

SEC. 3. (a) The United States Civil Service Commission, the Librarian of Congress, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, and the Secretary of Defense, respectively, with respect to those positions within the purview of subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively, of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the appropriate authority, with respect to those positions under jurisdiction of such authority which are allocated to or placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (including such positions so allocated or placed on a temporary or present incumbency basis), under any provision of law (including any reorganization plan) other than the above-specified subsections, which is in effect on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, shall submit, so long as such provision of law or reorganization plan remains in effect, to the Congress, not later than February 1 of each year, a report which sets forth—

(1) the total number of such positions allocated to or placed in all of such grades during the immediately preceding calendar year, the total number of such positions allocated to or placed in each of such grades during such immediately preceding calendar year, and the total number of such positions in existence during such immediately preceding calendar year and the grades to or in which such total number of positions in existence are allocated or placed,

(2) the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent of each such position, together with the position title and a statement of the duties and responsibilities performed by each such incumbent,

(3) the position or positions in or outside the Federal Government held by each such incumbent, and his rate or rates of compensation, during the five-year period immediately preceding the date of appointment of each such incumbent to such position, and

(4) such other information as the Commission, officer, or other appropriate authority submitting such report may deem appropriate.

Nothing contained in this subsection shall require the resubmission of any information required under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection which has been reported pursuant to this subsection and which remains unchanged.

(b) In any instance in which the Commission, officer, or other appropriate authority so required to submit such report may consider full public disclosure of any or all of the above-specified items to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest, such Commission, officer, or authority is authorized—

(1) to omit in such annual report those items with respect to which full public disclosure is considered to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest,

(2) to inform the Congress of such omission, and

(3) at the request of any congressional committee to which such report is referred, to present information concerning such items in executive sessions of such committee.

(c) Subsection (b) of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 179; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1105), is amended by striking out "The United States Civil Service Commission shall report annually to the Congress the total number of positions established under this subsection for grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schhedule and the total number of positions so established for each such grade.".

SEC. 4. (a) The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) That part of the paragraph under the heading "FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM" and under the subheading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS" contained in title II (the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1956) of the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 273; Public Law 133, Eighty-fourth Congress; 5 U. S. C., sec. 298a), which reads as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the Attorney General hereafter is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, to place three positions in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949"; and

(2) Section 633 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 320; Public Law 157, Eighty-fourth Congress; 5 U. S. C., sec. 171d–2).

(b) Positions in grade 16, 17, or 18, as the case may be, of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, under any provision of law repealed by subsection (a) of this section, shall remain, on and after such effective date, in their respective grades, until other action is taken under the provisions of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect on and after such effective date.

The CHAIRMAN. On March 7, this committee reported out H. R. 9560, which provided certain scientific and professional positions in connection with research to the Department of Defense and National Security Agency, and also to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Since that time the committee has received requests from the Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of the Interior for certain positions of scientific and professional nature and deemed it advisable to intro-

duce a new bill which would carry out the purposes of H. R. 9560, giving the positions which were already reported out to the Department of Defense and to the National Security Agency and National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and also to include positions requested by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior.

There is another change in the bill. The first bill reported out provided that reports from these agencies as to these agencies authorized should be made by the different departments and agencies to the Committees on Civil Service and Post Office of the House and Senate. That is not proper procedure. The report should be made to the Congress, to the Speaker of the House and Vice President in the Senate. That change is being made in H. R. 11040.

We will first hear from representatives of the Department of the Interior as to its need for these 10 scientific and research positions. Who is here representing the Secretary of the Interior?

STATEMENT OF OTIS BEASLEY, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BEASLEY. I am D. Otis Beasley, Administrative Assistant Secretary, Interior, and I have with me Dr. Nolan, Director of the Geological Survey and Mr. Miller, Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed in your own manner. Do you desire to present the case for the Department?

Mr. BEASLEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. BEASLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a statement which has been circulated among the members of the committee and in order to conserve time I will not read it but I will refer to certain parts of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Your entire paper will be copied in the record and then you can elaborate on the statement as you see fit.

(Statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SECRETARY D. OTIS BEASLEY IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TOP SCIENTIFIC AND ENGINEERING POSITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Department of the Interior recently submitted a draft of legislation that would authorize special rates of compensation for 10 positions in the scientific and professional research field. The proposed legislation has been incorporated with similar proposals by other Federal agencies and introduced in the House of Representatives as H. R. 11040.

Much national interest is currently focused on the serious shortage in the United States of scientists and engineers. This condition has been developing for some time. There is mounting alarm about what this shortage may mean for both our national security and our prosperity.

This committee is well acquainted with the problem brought about by this situation and its impact upon the Federal Government as evidenced in report No. 1857 of March 7, 1956, on H. R. 9560. My comments will be limited, therefore, to the reasons why the Department of the Interior needs authority for special rates of compensation for top scientists and engineers.

The Department of the Interior is the Federal Government's primary natural resource agency. It is our job to protect the public interest by assuring sound conservation and wise development of the Nation's water, land, minerals, and energy resources.

Research and resource development are important functions of Interior. Scientists and engineers are essential in carrying out these functions. In fact, the Department of the Interior is a major employer of scientists and engineers. There are more than 9,000 such professional employees in the Department.

The need for this legislation has been apparent for some time, and is becoming increasingly critical as time goes on. Because of the limitations in the members of top positions under the Classification Act, a large majority of employees are kept at grade 15 and below. The maximum salary for grade 15 is $12,690. More and more of our top scientists and engineers are finding it necessary to leave Government service for more attractive compensation.

If we are to continue fundamental research and development of the caliber for which the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines is noted, something must be done in order to reward persons engaged in this work.

New areas of research have developed since World War II as a result of new functions charged to the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines in connection with atomic energy and with critical problems dealing with such areas as strategic minerals and water resources. If supported by appropriate research endeavors, this will result in important contributions to the national economic and military welfare.

For example, the Bureau of Mines pioneered in research and experimentation with zirconium. This strong, lightweight metal is a vital material in the powerplant of the first atomic submarine.

Modern geological research methods are pointing the way to new sources of domestic mineral deposits, and improved technology, both in research and in recovery, is making it possible to utilize these mineral resources and other resources previously considered unprofitable to develop.

Through the years our scientific bureaus have relied upon the devoted service of many learned and distinguished scientists—men of international reputation in their professions. Many of these men have remained with the Government because of the opportunity afforded for research and because of the interest they have in the work of their respective organizations in spite of the low monetary returns. Only increased living costs and economic pressures, plus the necessity for personal security, are now making it necessary for these men to consider outside employment.

A primary function of the Geological Survey is to perform fundamental research that requires the highest level of ability to obtain results. In such research, highly qualified scientific minds are even more essential than in applied research and development. Outstanding scientists are vital to provide the leadership in research. There is abundant evidence of the outstanding contributions of the Geological Survey to science and the national welfare and of the wide recognition accorded to scientists by other groups. Some examples of recognition are as follows:

1. Ten scientists of the Geological Survey are currently members of the National Academy of Science.

2. A substantial number of medals and honors have been awarded to Geological Survey scientists by national learned societies, including: The Fritz Medal of the Associated Engineering Societies; the Penrose Medal of the Geological Society of America (to 5 Geological Survey scientists); the Roebling Medal of the Mineralogical Society of America (to 3 Geological Survey scientists); the K. D. Li Medal for tungsten research; Bowie Medal of American Geophysical Union; and others.

3. A great number of Geological Survey scientists have been elected to the office of president of national and international learned societies in professions related to the work of the Geological Survey.

4. Representation on Federal or professional committees, boards, and panels.

Geological Survey scientists and engineers have been internationally recognized as responsible for the establishment or orderly development of a number of branches in science such as:

1. The science of ground-water geology through the successful fusion of engineering and geologic techniques.

2. The science of mining geology and the understanding of ore-forming processes.

3. The science of geochemistry.

4. The science of geomorphology of surficial geological process.

5. The understanding of basin and range structure.

78737—56——2

Many Geological Survey scientific publications have been acclaimed as standard reference works by scientists the world over. At a recent college conference sponsored by the National Science Foundation, the following quotation emphasized their importance: "* * * publications of the United States Geological Survey are of fundamental importance to the colleges. Indeed, Government publications play a more important role in geology than in any other science."

What has been said with reference to the research and the research scientists in the Geological Survey is equally true of the Bureau of Mines scientists and engineers. Organizations such as the American Chemistry Society, American Institute of Chemical Engineering, American Institute of Mineral and Metallurgical Engineering, American Gas Association, and others are proud to include among their membership mining, petroleum, chemical engineers and chemists, employees of the Bureau of Mines.

It is recognized that the Federal Government cannot afford to compete nor should attempt to compete with such salary offers as are paid in private industry. We can, however, succeed in attracting and holding a great number of our qualified personnel by raising the salary ceiling for some of our outstanding research specialists.

In recent years the loss to the Government service of these men has become alarming, and, in certain areas, critical conditions exist because of their resignations. Modern research programs of the Geological Survey and development and recovery programs of the Bureau of Mines cannot progress effectively unless we are able to retain in our service scientists of top caliber and professional competency.

It is believed that the creation of these positions will enable the Department to attract scientists who have indicated an interest in the Department's programs, and also to retain in our service leading scientists currently employed. At the same time, it would give encouragement to young scientists and engineers coming into the Federal Government at lower levels in that it would provide a larger salary ceiling than has heretofore been the case.

For these reasons it is urged that the proposed legislation be enacted.

Mr. BEASLEY. The Department of the Interior appreciates the opportunity to present to this committee the reasons why it should be considered in legislation proposing special rates of compensation for scientists and engineers. The committee obviously understands this problem quite well as evidenced in its report 1857 of March 7, 1956, on H. R. 9560.

The Department of the Interior is the Federal Government's primary natural-resource agency. It is our job to protect the public interest by assuring sound conservation and wise development of the Nation's water, lands, mineral, and energy resources.

Engineers and scientists are essential in carrying out the programs associated with the responsibilities of the Interior Department. In fact, the Interior Department is a major employer of scientists and engineers. There are more than 9,000 such professional employees in the Interior Department. We have experienced recently the loss of some of our outstanding scientists and engineers because of the difference in compensation existing between Government and private enterprise. We are not attempting to compete with the salary of private enterprise and we do not think that the Government should necessarily do so. We do feel, however, that the compensation paid to scientists and engineers should be more comparable than it now is in relationship to those salaries in order that we might encourage our outstanding scientists and engineers to remain with the Federal Government as well as to encourage young scientists and engineers to accept employment with the Government; and I am sure that this legislation will accomplish that purpose inasmuch as it will give them some incentive to work for the Government with a higher range of salaries as they gain experience.

The Interior proposal is for 10 positions to be covered in this legislation. At the time the legislation was submitted we had in mind only the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines. I would be glad to answer any questions concerning the Department's proposal that the members of the committee may have and I am sure that the Director of the Geological Survey and Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines can give you more details concerning the particular positions and type of outstanding qualifications that would be required in exercising the authority we are seeking.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be glad to hear from Mr. Nolan, Director of the Geological Survey, as to the need for any of these positions in his particular division.

STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS B. NOLAN, DIRECTOR, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I also have a statement here which I would be glad to put into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be put in the record.

(Statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS B. NOLAN, DIRECTOR, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, BEFORE HOUSE CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE ON H. R. 11040

One of the primary functions of the Geological Survey is to engage in basic research in the field of our natural resources, including minerals, fuels, and water. Our programs over 75 years have always included continuing long-range systematic research projects that are designed to produce results in the national interest but which by reasons of broad geographic coverage, access to confidential information, and absence of the profit motive could not be undertaken by private groups. To do this successfully we must attract, and retain, men and women of great ability, thorough training, high integrity, dedication to research, and a fundamental interest in public service.

Productive basic research in the fields in which the Survey is active and has been so successful is in large part done by creative scientists and engineers working essentially independently—they need relatively few associates to assist them and hence rarely are the directors or supervisors of large numbers of technical employees or complex organizational units. Men and women of these qualifications and capacities not only blaze new trails in our efforts to learn more about the nature and distribution of our national resources but also are especially effective in attracting younger research workers to join the organization and in providing them inspirational guidance and mature leadership.

The success of a scientific and technical program rests largely on the quality and leadership of its individual scientists. In the face of high living costs and continued financial inducements offered by industry and leading universities, an increasing number of outstanding Survey scientists and engineers have felt compelled to leave the Goverment service. Their loss has unquestionably interrupted excellent research projects and impaired the Survey program, particularly in view of the inability of the Survey to attract equally outstanding scientists to replace them. The highly qualified men remaining in the organization are constantly under pressure of outside offers that range from 25 percent to double their Survey salary. Government cannot afford to compete, nor should it attempt to compete, with such salary offers. The Survey can, however, hold many of its qualified personnel, partly through providing a satisfactory research environment and partly by proposals, such as the one under discussion, to raise the salary ceiling for its outstanding research scientists.

There have been a number of studies in recent years that disclose the great disparity between salaries paid scientists and engineers engaged in scientific and engineering research in private industry and universities, and the salaries paid to individuals of comparable experience and stature in the Geological Survey.

Two recent nationwide surveys sharply demonstrate this disparity. For example, of 10,087 geologic and geophysical scientists reporting to the American Geological Institute, about 1,600 (16 percent) were in the Federal service. The tabulation revealed that of 902 in the total group receiving $15,000 or more per annum, none was a Federal employee—nor could be, because of current Federal compensation legislation. In the salary range above $12,500 per annum, 1,340 (13.3 percent) were tabulated; but of their number only 15 were Federal employees and most of them occupied top administrative rather than solely research positions. Stated in another fashion, in the reporting group of 10,087 geologists and related scientists, 15.5 percent of the non-Government scientists, but less than 1 percent of the Government scientists, received more than $12,500 per annum. Industry and private institutions have a favorable position of better than 15:1 over Government because of current restrictive legislation.

In another nationwide survey in which 56,464 research and development scientists and engineers reported, 8,413 (nearly 15 percent) were Federal employees. Of the total, 1,890 employees in industry and private institutions, and 88 in Government, received more than $11,400 per annum. The ratio is 4:1 in favor of non-Government employees. Again, the Government positions were practically all administrative, while a great many of the non-Government positions were nonadministrative and lone-worker research jobs.

These surveys demonstrate that the disparity is even greater for scientists and engineers in the Geological Survey than for all scientists in Government. In view of the leading role that research scientists in the Geological Survey have had in developing many widely used fundamental principles in hydrology, photogrammetry, geology, and other fields of science, the proposal to raise the ceiling for nonadministrative scientists in this Bureau is timely and well-merited and would be most helpful in attracting and retaining present and future research leaders in the Geological Survey.

Mr. NOLAN. I would like to refer to one particular point that we think is illustrative of our difficulties in attracting and retaining people to work in this field of natural resources, particularly minerals and water. There have been two recent nationwide surveys which show up very sharply the disparity in wages between the industry and universities and those in the Government. One of these was made of 10,087 geologic and geophysical scientists by the American Geological Institute. Of these, about 1,600 or 16 percent were in the Federal service. A tabulation revealed that of 902 in the total group receiving $15,000 or more per annum not a single one was a Federal employee. In the salary range above $12,500, 1,340, or 13.3 percent, were in that range, but of this number only 15 were Federal employees. That is about one-tenth of 1 percent and most of these 15 were in administrative rather than research positions.

Stated in another fashion, in the reporting group of 10,087 geologists and related scientists 15.5 percent of the non-Government scientists but less than 1 percent of the Government scientists received more than $12,500 a year. Industry and private institutions thus have a favorable position of better than 15 to 1 over Government because of the current restrictive legislation.

We have been unusually successful, I think, in attracting and retaining able men in the face of this salary disparity but the rate at which the dispartiy is increasing in the last few years seems to us to make it imperative that we provide or are able to provide a somewhat better incentive to the people that we feel we need.

The CHAIRMAN. How many employees are in the Geological Survey now?

Mr. NOLAN. In this professional group we have 3,500, sir. They are divided almost equally between geologists and other scientists, chemists, physicists, engineers; largely hydraulic engineers in our water work and cartographic engineers, 3,497.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to hear from Mr. Thomas Miller, Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS MILLER, ACTING DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF MINES

Mr. MILLER. I do not have a prepared statement. With your permission I will explain briefly our interest.

Our problems are almost identical with those Mr. Nolan just stated. The Bureau's work centers around the extractive industries, recovery and removal of minerals from the ground and the extraction of the economic or valuable portions of that. In those fields we have many serious technical problems, both in mining and in the metallurgical or benefication treatment of those minerals.

The Bureau's interests are in developing more economical and safer methods of doing these things, newer and improved mining methods, newer and improved metallurgical processes, the development of new extractive processes for recovery of new materials like zirconium or titanium or thorium, materials of that kind.

Also, in the field of fuel we have the same problem: The recovery of coal and petroleum from the ground and treatment, conversion of those materials into more usable, more efficient liquid and gaseous products.

In all these areas we need scientists of the highest caliber to perfect and guide the workers in development of these new processes. We have the same handicaps in trying to reach up to the salary that industry is able to pay and does pay these people. Our staff is handicapped by limiting most of our top people in these fields to the top grade, 15, and that salary is not now adequate to attract the caliber of people we would like to work in to replace our existing staffs and so on. We cannot build our staff to the necessary level.

I will be glad to answer any specific questions of the committee. It is a very general statement.

The CHAIRMAN. How many supergrade positions does the Department have today?

Mr. BEASLEY. I cannot answer that question specifically. We have recently received additional positions. I would say it is in the neighborhood of 30.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions of any of the witnesses?

Mr. GROSS. How were these being divided as between the Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines?

Mr. BEASLEY. Equally divided.

Mr. GROSS. Five each?

Mr. BEASLEY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Have you previously made application to Civil Service Commission for super grades?

Mr. BEASLEY. Not for the positions that would be covered under this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. BEASLEY. Because of the limitations on the supergrades. We have limited our request to those in the line of supervision that rated more administrative responsibility. Consequently, we have never been able to get to the type of position that we are seeking to be covered by this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. If the Civil Service Commission had spaces available, you could get them, could you not, if the Commission was agreeable to providing them for you?

Mr. BEASLEY. Yes, we could.

Mr. GROSS. But you have not made applications?

Mr. BEASLEY. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I see. One other question. I do not want to go into it here. Do you have any instances now in the Department of the Interior where you have 2 men drawing approximately $10,000 each with divided authority, 1 doing nothing for a period of perhaps 2 to 2½ years? Do you have any instances in the Department of the Interior? I think you know the case I am talking about.

Mr. BEASLEY. I am sure I do know the case you are talking about and I am confident there is no such situation prevailing today.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad that that is the situation.

Some time I hope this committee will go further into the situation that did prevail because it has never been properly cleared up.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

Mr. ALEXANDER. If they were made available, would these new places be given to people you now have on the payroll as advancements, or would you feel that you would be bringing in new blood?

Mr. BEASLEY. It is our belief that all these positions will be filled by the appointment of personnel now in the service.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Are you having any particular difficulty in keeping the people you have?

Mr. BEASLEY. I would like Dr. Nolan to answer that question because I believe he can cite instances where employees have received offers of salary far in excess of what they are receiving in the Government and yet remain with the Government, and some, I believe, have left.

Mr. NOLAN. Certainly the people that we would consider for appointment to these grades, if they are authorized, are individuals who are currently receiving offers from universities as well as from industry at salary grades from a quarter more to double their present salaries. Within the last month we have had two of our men, each of whom I would hope would be considered for appointment to one of these positions, offered teaching jobs at something on the order of 25 percent increase over their current GS–15 salaries. One of them has had three such offers from major universities within the last year.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Would the creation of 10 of the proposed positions here create further trouble down the line or not?

Mr. NOLAN. The impression I have, sir, is that the effect of this would be extremely salutary all the way along the line in that it would indicate the possibility of advancement to salaries that are more nearly comparable to the ones that many of our ablest men are being offered. Many of them, I think, have a sense of dedication to the public service, if I can phrase it that way, that would make them prefer to stay with the Geological Survey and the Interior Department if there were the likelihood that they could look forward to something approaching the salaries that are attainable outside. We feel that this would be not only a tremendous advantage in retaining this small number of men who would be able to fill these jobs, but in attracting younger men showing there are opportunities in research work of the Survey that they can look forward to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Those would be new people on the bottom?

Mr. NOLAN. Most appointments are made at the GS–5 and GS–7 grade, though this is becoming more difficult as the competition is affecting those lower grades. We are being forced to consider the 9's now, which is getting closer to the competitive level.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Miller, you mentioned about your facilities for developing petroleum products, and so forth. Does not private industry have centers for that purpose for research in petroleum and other products?

Mr. MILLER. That is quite true, We have just completed a survey of the work now being performed in 14 petroleum laboratories, large petroleum company laboratories, to determine to what extent, if any, the Bureau work was overlapping that being done by industry. Almost none of the work of our Bureau is being tackled by industry. Industry is primarily concerned with the actual commercial or marketing phases of the job, product evaluation, development of marketing devices rather than fundamental research we are doing on the fundamental characteristics of crude petroleum, for instance. Almost without exception we found the things our laboratories are doing are not duplicated anywhere by the work being done by the laboratories of the private oil companies.

Mr. LESINSKI. Not being duplicated, but might be helpful in the future?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly the companies are quite interested in the work we are doing, but they do not propose to do it. They would prefer to have the Government do it. They would suport us in trying to do that work.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I know some companies have research centers. If it is duplicated it is a waste of money.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no duplication?

Mr. MILLER. We have also some advisory committees from the American Petroleum Institute and American Gas Association who work jointly with us to see we do not overlap and duplicate work being done by industry.

Mr. REES. Regarding these professors getting more money, there is some advantage in being in Government rather than teaching by way of retirement benefits and sick benefits that you do have in Government and would not have in teaching?

Mr. NOLAN. In several of the universities I understand that their retirement plans are becoming quite comparable.

Mr. REES. There are some who retire from this service and go and teach afterward.

Mr. NOLAN. We have had somewhat the other experience about getting some university people who retired.

Mr. CRETELLA. How much of a turnover do you have in these supergrade jobs?

Mr. NOLAN. We have only two supergrades in the Survey, sir, and they are both administrative jobs. Do you mean turnover in the personnel as a whole?

Mr. CRETELLA. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. As a whole, the turnover averages just under 1 percent a month, which is about 11½ percent a year. I think it is about the same in the professional grades as in the clerical grades. That is an overall figure.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

We will next hear from representatives of the Department of Commerce concerning the text of the bill which would allocate 25 of these scientific and professional positions to that Department.

STATEMENTS OF DR. CARLTON W. HAYWARD, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT; DR. A. V. ASTIN, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS; AND DR. FRANCIS W. REICHELDERFER, CHIEF, WEATHER BUREAU

Mr. HAYWARD. I am Carlton W. Hayward, Director of Personnel, and I have with me Dr. Reichelderfer, Chief of the Weather Bureau, and Dr. Astin, Chief of the Bureau of Standards. We have a prepared statement which has been furnished.

The CHAIRMAN. Let all your statements be inserted in the record.

(Information referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

To authorize the establishment of 35 positions for specially qualified scientific and professional personnel in the Department of Commerce with rates of compensation comparable to rates authorized by Public Law 318, 80th Congress

The proposed legislation would authorize the Department of Commerce to establish the salaries of 35 scientific or professional positions at rates comparable to rates authorized by Public Law 313, 80th Congress.

For many years the Government has been faced with great difficulty in the recruitment of scientific and professional personnel. Persons who are eminently qualified in scientific and professional fields are able to command large salaries from private industry and business organizations. The Government has been unable to offer to such people comparable salaries, and the only inducements which it has been able to offer have been the fact that scientific and professional work for the Government is of great importance to the Nation at large, and that Government research affords an opportunity to work in the field to which they have dedicated their lives. This argument has had some success in recruiting persons eminently qualified in their fields.

In the face of rising living costs, however, and the general increase in salaries in private industry, persons who formerly would have been willing to make the personal sacrifices necessary, if Government work is to be undertaken or continued, no longer find themselves able to do so. The Department of Defense, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the Public Health Service, recognizing this problem, each requested and received authority to establish positions in the scientific and technical service, the salaries to be set at the discretion of the head of the agency within the range authorized by Public Law 313. By Public Law 313, 80th Congress, and Public Law 167, 81st Congress, the Department of Defense was authorized to establish 45 such positions and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics 10 such positions. By Public Law 692, 81st Congress, the Public Health Service was authorized to establish 30 such positions.

In reporting out the legislation which provided such positions for the Public Health Service, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare stated:

"* * * The full potentialities of the whole research staff of the Public Health Service can be brought out only if those who guide its research activities combine research talents of the highest order with ability to stimulate others and to administer large programs. This combination of talents is rare. Persons who possess them command high salaries.

"The provision in the bill now under discussion will not make it possible for the Service to pay salaries competitive with the compensation which such people can secure outside the Government. However, we are informed that the research opportunities in the Public Health Service are so challenging to men of the highest caliber that they are willing to make some sacrifice in income for the chance to do work to which their lives are dedicated. What they must have is an income that will make the financial sacrifice bearable. Payment of salaries up

to $15,000 per year to a limited number of scientific and professional persons engaged in research and scientific activities of the Public Health Service will make it possible to keep men of the highest attainments who cannot afford to turn down opportunities to double or triple their income, and to attract men who will sacrifice money but who cannot afford to work at the prevailing $10,000 salary ceiling. The maximum possible total cost of the proposed salary increase is $150,000 per year. This would seem to be a small investment in terms of the resulting increase in the productivity of the Federal Government's medical research program."

The statements made in the committee's report with respect to the Public Health Service apply with equal potency to the research activities of this Department.

In order to meet the competition for key personnel in the scientific field, this Department believes it necessary that we obtain authority to pay a limited number of our key scientific and professional personnel salaries at rates authorized by Public Law 313 without regard to the salary schedules set forth in the Classification Act. Classification in the supergrades of the positions occupied by these key scientists would not solve our problem since we must have authority to compete with the offers of private industry and other agencies for key personnel, regardless of the classification of the positions which such key personnel happen to occupy or are being considered for.

If the proposed legislation authorizing 35 such positions is enacted, we plan to assign the extra compensation for the present to the following areas:

Twenty-three of these positions would be in the National Bureau of Standards. The Bureau is the largest scientific research agency of the Department, and is constituted to provide the following functions:

(*a*) The custody, maintenance, and development of the national standards of measurement, and the provision of means and methods for making measurement consistent with those standards, including the comparison of standards used in scientific investigations, engineering, manufacturing, commerce, and educational institutions with the standards adopted or recognized by the Government.

(*b*) The determination of physical constants and properties of materials when such data are of great importance to scientific or manufacturing interests and are not to be obtained of sufficient accuracy elsewhere.

(*c*) The development of methods for testing materials, mechanisms, and structures, and the testing of materials, supplies, and equipment, including items purchased for use of Government departments and independent establishments.

(*d*) Cooperation with other governmental agencies and with private organization in the establishment of standard practices, incorporated in codes and specifications.

(*e*) Advisory service to Government agencies on scientific and technical problems.

(*f*) Invention and development of devices to serve special needs of the Government.

As stated in a recent report dated October 15, 1953, to the Secretary of Commerce by an Ad Hoc Committee for Evaluation of the Present Functions and Operations of the National Bureau of Standards, composed of leading scientists representative of national industry and universities:

"The functions authorized for the Bureau of Standards are of great importance to national welfare. As our society becomes increasingly industrialized, these functions assume even greater importance and the work of the Bureau in meeting the obligations of its assigned functions becomes more highly scientific, broader in scope and more complex in organization * * *

"In a society whose welfare is so dependent on applied science and technology as is our own, it is most important that the Government carry out those functions in support of science and technology that are uniquely in its province in the most effective manner possible and that a sufficiently high level of effort be maintained to insure an adequate coverage of the area of responsibility.

"It is the committee's considered judgment that our highly industrialized society required a Bureau of Standards that is the finest that can be created. To the extent that the Bureau is weak or inadequate, our technologic society is handicapping itself. By the very nature of its functions the Bureau's work must not be 'reasonably good,' it must be superior. It is not sufficient to have fairly good standards of measurement; fairly good methods of testing materials,

mechanisms or structures; or reasonably good determination of important physical constants. The standards, the measurements, the test procedures must be the very best, the most accurate, the most reliable that can possibly be achieved at any given time, limited only by the state of the art at the time. It is thus more than a play on words to say that the 'standards' by which the Bureau in judged must be the very highest and best."

The Bureau is organized along functional lines for its operations, the 17 technical operating divisions corresponding either with professional specialties long established in the sciences and in technical or special end project areas in which the Bureau has important programs. Very heavy responsibility is vested in the chiefs of these divisions in the formulation, direction, and evaluation of their programs in order to maintain proper balance and sufficient scientific merit to insure the continued leadership of the Bureau in the fields of physical sciences, engineering and mathematics. The caliber of scientific leadership necessary for their successful and vigorous execution demands the recruitment and retention of the most qualified scientific and professional personnel available. Individual qualifications in many instances require scientists possessing reputations, national and international, to fit them to serve as able representatives of the National Bureau of Standards and the Government of the United States.

The first general group of 17 of the positions requested in this legislation would be assigned to persons directing the technical operating divisions of the Bureau. The present salary and classification ceilings are far too low to attract and hold outstanding men with qualifications necessary for the superior accomplishment of the functions of these divisions. The Bureau is constantly losing employees to industry and universities whose grade levels are less than the chiefs of the divisions, whose scientific competence frequently is inferior to these division chiefs, and whose years of experience are generally far short of those possessed by these division chiefs. Yet the salary inducements offered to these admittedly junior scientific personnel exceed those available under the Classification Act to the chiefs of the technical operating divisions of which they were members. For example, the Bureau recently lost two employees of the Engineering Mechanics Section of the Mechanics Division to a large industrial firm. Each employee is to head a phase of the company's research program at an initial salary of approximately $15,000 per year, with an opportunity to advance to at least $25,000 in the same job. An employee in the Ionospheric Research Section has been offered $25,000 per year. Two other members of the same group have left Bureau employment for offers approximating $15,000 per year. The chiefs of the technical operating divisions could without exception improve their monetary situation by leaving Government service. Several of these men are eligible for retirement in the relatively near future. The Bureau has on its staff in some cases employees well qualified to succeed to these positions who are more likely to be retained if this proposed legislation is enacted. Also, other scientists with outstanding qualifications would be available for possible appointment if the salary discrepancy between Federal and non-Federal rates were reduced by the amounts available through approval of this proposed legislation. We feel that each of these positions is vitally significant to the maintenance of technical competence in the Bureau. Because of the varying degrees of competence of individuals and internal alinements considerations, it is felt that the flexibility achievable through employment at a figure within the ranges authorized by Public Law 313 would provide a more suitable method of compensation than at fixed rates under the Classification Act of 1949.

The second general group of six positions requested under this authority would be used for positions to be called National Bureau of Standards research fellows. These positions are to represent the highest nonadministrative technical positions in the organization, and are to be filled on the basis of outstanding accomplishments and recognized superior achievements. They will be filled primarily from within the organization as a recognition of achievement, and would be accorded freedom of selection and conduct of individual research, without collateral supervisory or administrative duties. Appointments of National Bureau of Standards research fellows would be made by the Director from nominations initiated by scientific and technical groups both within and outside the Bureau. It is believed that availability of these fellowships will enhance immeasurably the recognition and retention of current Bureau staff members who have demonstrated extraordinary research competence, and would provide a recruitment attraction to outstanding scientists from outside of the Bureau who could bring fresh knowledge and stimulation to its staff.

Five of the positions would be in the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The engineering and development work of the Civil Aeronautics Administration also has vital national defense significance. This development is coordinated with research and development activities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and is not a duplication thereof.

The development of air navigation and air traffic control aids includes such items, among others, as very high-frequency omnidirectional radio range, radar distance measuring equipment, airport surveillance radar, microwave navigation aids, electronic landing systems and anticollision devices. At the present time there are considerable pressures in the form of immediate demands for a greatly expanded system and fairly immediate demands for a soundly engineered automatic system making the fullest practical use of the possibilities of self-informing, self-evaluating, self-correcting equipment or components.

The engineering and cost considerations of such a system cannot be defined now in other than terms. The engineering of the airways system, like most dynamic engineering programs has historically been one of recognizing limitations and then removing them. Foreseeable changes in the makeup of the system, however, will be more radical in nature and tempo than those of the past 10 years. Finally, all new developments in the electronics art and the principles of automation must be drawn upon for application to the Federal airways system. The system, however, is a special purpose one with requirements peculiar to itself, and creation as well as adaptation is involved in the engineering development program.

These positions, if authorized will be used generally as follows:

(*a*) Development of the theoretical and practical concepts for a modernized system for controlling air traffic. This involves the application of the theoretical concepts of mathematics and physics in exploring the possibilities of a modernized system, not only in terms of increased air traffic volume but of possible radical changes in the character of air traffic.

(*b*) The application of physical, as well as mathematical principles to air traffic control planning.

(*c*) The planning and directing of Civil Aeronautics Administration's activities in the field of applied research which includes the development, testing and evaluation of physical and engineering equipment, facilities and processes.

(*d*) The accomplishment of Civil Aeronautics Administration's programs and projects concerned with the development and in-service improvement of air navigation and air traffic control equipment, components and systems.

(*e*) The excution of Civil Aeronautics Administration's programs and projects concerning the technical and operational evaluation of navigation and traffic control equipment, systems, techniques, and procedures.

Three positions requested would be in the Maritime Administration which includes among its functions those technical and scientific activities relating to research and testing in connection with specific problems of ship design, technical development and research.

One of these positions would be assigned to Maritime Administration's top technical expert and technical and engineering adviser in the field of nuclear power engineering including related planning and investigative research for nuclear powered merchant ships. Due to the newness of the field of nuclear energy, there is a great need for extensive research and development, the solution to which can best be approached through the recruitment of a specifically qualified scientist to direct this advanced scientific and engineering program.

Another position would be in the research and development programs relating to both peacetime and national defense maritime activities and would be assigned to an individual who would carry the responsibility for the coordination with the Defense Department on the merchant marine aspects of undersea warfare and amphibious operations, and with the National Research Council on industry-military technical projects for improvement of vessel utilization.

The third position would be reserved for the Maritime Administration's top expert in the field of merchant ship design. Included in the design process is the determination of basic ship characteristics, the preparation of final plans and specifications, materials specifications, outfitting equipment as well as hull and machinery components, and approval of detailed working plans during construction. This covers activities connected with the greatest peacetime shipbuilding and ship repair program in Maritime's history.

We plan to allocate two positions to the Weather Bureau at this time. The scientific research activities of the United States Weather Bureau are extremely important to the national defense. During wartime when troops, planes, and equipment are ready, the hour of the attack depends greatly and sometimes entirely on favorable weather. The weather forecaster is literally the man behind the scenes who tells when the attack is launched and history shows how much its success depends upon his accuracy. Years of research in meteorology, dynamical investigations, instrument development and specific forecasting are focused on military requirements and strategic planning. Fortunately, these achievements lend themselves not only to combat but also to the day-to-day operations of industry and agriculture, so the benefits go to the general public as well as to the military forces.

The science of predicting and thereby avoiding losses from storm, flood, and tornado on the one hand, and of forecasting good growing weather and fair travel seasons, on the other, is deeply rooted in complex investigations of our earth and atmosphere. They call for studies in physics, chemistry, engineering, and mechanics and use the waters, snows, and deserts as laboratories as well as the various observatories and indoor stations.

Center of these activities is the Weather Bureau. Since its inception the bureau has been responsible for the civil meteorological functions of the Signal Corps of the Army and since 1904 for the weather functions of the Navy Hydrographic Office. Later enactments added more duties, chiefly for aviation and military use.

If the positions proposed in this bill are authorized, we would allocate two positions to the Weather Bureau as follows:

(*a*) To the Director of Meteorological Research, an officer responsible for the Bureau's meteorological research program. The ultimate solution of a wide variety of basic meteorological problems of international scope and consequence depends upon retention of a person of the highest caliber. A recent survey of meteorologist positions by the National Science Foundation (at the request of the Civil Service Commission) revealed a number of positions of less responsibility with salaries of between $15,000 and in excess of $25,000.

(*b*) To the Director of Physical Research who must be an eminently qualified physicist with nationally recognized research ability and extensive experience. The present incumbent has had at least one offer of $14,000 from another agency since coming to the Weather Bureau. Nuclear developmental work and missile projects continue to cause ever-increasing demands for high level talent in the physics field and it will become increasingly difficult for the Bureau to retain this employee within the salary limitation imposed by the Classification Act.

We plan to allocate two of these positions to the Coast and Geodetic Survey. For a number of years we have felt the need for a high level scientist in the field of tidal phenomena to supplement our present staff engaged in that phase of our operations. The person required, in our opinion, should be kept somewhat free of involvement in day-to-day operations but should be allowed to direct his efforts toward the broad investigation and conduct of research in the various phases of tidal phenomena to help solve problems pertaining to: Tidal theories; improved methods of analysis and prediction of tides; effect of geographic and hydrographic features on tidal phenomena; predictions of flow patterns due to tidal phenomena; effects of storm surges on water levels for incorporation in tide and current tables; causes of secular variations in sea level; and salinity intrusions as related to tidal phenomena.

In a like manner, it has become apparent during the past several years that the services of a high level physicist in the Geodesy Division of the Coast and Geodetic Survey are required if we are to fulfill properly our functions as advisor and consultant in the field of modern weapons systems.

Just as the developers of these weapons systems are badly in need of geodesists, we are in need of personnel with basic training to understand the complex physical aspects of the weapons. While we have some employees well trained in all aspects of geodesy, we have none with the basic training of theoretical physics at the doctorate level. The addition of such a qualified scientist to our staff would greatly enhance the value of our work to the Nation from a defense and a scientific standpoint.

Because of the unique nature of the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the availability of the highly qualified individuals as described above is negligible. However, there are a small number of scientists who do have the quali-

fications desired, but currently are fully occupied in positions at pay scales beyond the reach of the present classification structure.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that the House is meeting early today, can you gentlemen generally expedite your testimony by just highlighting your prepared statement?

Mr. HAYWARD. All right. We are, of course, faced with the same great difficulty in not only keeping our scientific and professional people but also in recruiting people to come in even at the lower levels. We find now that universities even are indicating to the graduating students that the opportunities are not as great in Government as they are in outside industry.

We have lost a number of people in the Department at high scientific levels in the past year. It is a question of how many more we will lose probably before the end of this year judging by some of the offers some of them have.

I think generally our story is pretty much the same as that of Interior as far as the difficulties are concerned.

You might like to hear from Dr. Astin.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear from Dr. Astin.

Dr. ASTIN. The National Bureau of Standards has responsibility for providing the standards for physical measurement, precise determinations on fundamental physical constants, properties of materials and standard testing methods for the scientific and engineering community.

Fulfillment of these responsibilities requires the highest degree of competence in all major fields of science and engineering. And it is for this reason that I think we have most unusual requirements for top level people in all major branches of science and engineering.

To carry out our technical responsibilities we are organized into 17 scientific and engineering organizational units. Then I have five associates who assist me in planning, formulating and directing the overall program. Then, in addition, we are proposing to set up six top level scientific positions not to be encumbered with administrative responsibility. We feel this is most important if we are to retain the scientific leadership we have to have to do our job effectively.

In the category of our 17 division chiefs and 5 associate directors we have had, over the past 2 years, approximately 9 vacancies to fill. Normally we would prefer to fill these by promotion from within, taking someone below the man who has vacated the position. It has been possible to do this only in a few cases. We attempted to do recruiting for these positions outside and found it impossible at the salaries we are able to pay to get any interest at all outside in having someone come into take these positions.

A few were filled by direct promotion up, some were filled by reshuffling or transfer within the organization and in one instance we were able to get a man from another Government agency to come and take the job at about a $3,000 loss. He had been holding one of these Public Law 313 type positions but was sufficiently interested in our work to take this loss.

In addition, the majority of the people now in these positions are subjected almost continuously, as Dr. Nolan said some of his people are, to very attractive offers from outside, usually ranging from at least 50 to over 100 percent of their present salaries.

Mr. REES. Who asks for them?

Dr. ASTIN. Primarily industry, the electronics industry, mechanical engineering industry, the nuclear energy industry, or the nuclear energy industry that is in the process of developing. There is, of course, tremendous interest in scientific and engineering work at this time and we get numerous requests of this sort.

In this same line I very frequently am solicited by these high-level personnel placement positions to recommend people presumably from within our organization for top level engineering and scientific positions. Since January I have been asked to make recommendations for 5 such positions in the $25,000 to $30,000 per year category.

The CHAIRMAN. We all know there is a tremendous demand for scientists and technical professions today. You pick up the New York Times paper on Sunday and there is page after page of ads for scientists and research men of all types.

Dr. ASTIN. That example is a very striking one, I think, of the pressures to which our most competent people are being continuously subjected.

Mr. ROBESON. What do you do about the requests to recommend these people?

Dr. ASTIN. I advised all of our senior people of these opportunities and told them, if they wished, here was a chance for them, and to the best of my knowledge so far none of them has been taken up.

The CHAIRMAN. They have been with you a good many years?

Dr. ASTIN. On the average, I would say the people in these senior positions have been with us over 20 years. The lack of opportunity at the top is a cause of loss of very promising people at the intermediate level. For example, we have been very successful, I think, in having our younger staff members named as winners of the Arthur Fleming award, which is given annually by the junior chambers of commerce to outstanding Government employees. Since that award has been established five of our promising young staff members have been honored as Arthur Fleming award recipients. Four of those are no longer with us. They left us, I think, because they have been disappointed by the opportunity for promotion.

The CHAIRMAN. We will have Dr. Reichelderfer make a statement and then all of you may be questioned. Mr. Reichelderfer is Chief of the Weather Bureau.

Dr. REICHELDERFER. I would like to present a brief written statement.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be printed for the record.

(Statement referred to follows:)

GENERAL STATEMENT, WEATHER BUREAU

(Proposed bill to authorize 35 positions for specially qualified scientific and professional personnel in the Department of Commerce)

The justifications for special rates of compensation for specially qualified meteorologists are similar to those for aeronautical engineers, physicists, and other leading research personnel. In view of the extensive knowledge of physics and mathematics involved in meteorological research and leadership in technical meteorological services, the justifications are in some respects even stronger. This special feature is presented briefly in the following paragraphs.

There is a serious shortage of top-level meteorologists throughout the world. In a recent meeting of a committee of the National Academy of Sciences which considered this subject along with others pertaining to meteorological develop-

ment, it was brought out that meteorology has failed to attract its share of the better qualified recruits in science, partly because the science entails unusually extensive knowledge of other physical sciences and partly because the salaries paid to meteorologists in Government services have been notoriously low.

Meteorological research is increasingly important in connection with many of the basic economic and social problems of the world—land utilization and crop production, control of damage from severe storms, droughts, and other unfavorable atmospheric conditions, atomic energy and atomic warfare as affected by winds and other atmospheric conditions, and the general problems of flood control and adequate water supply for the growing populations and industrial requirements of the world. It is important to foster recruitment and development in meteorology and the provisions of the proposed bill would be one small step in the right direction.

The Weather Bureau, like other technical agencies, experiences more and more difficulty in recruitment of highly qualified meteorologists because of the competition for their services and the higher salaries available in private industry. The Bureau has had similar difficulty in retaining its best qualified meteorologists. These difficulties could be illustrated by reference to specific cases. The provisions in the proposed bill for two positions under these special compensation terms represent a very modest estimate of our needs and we urgently request approval of these positions in connection with the general authorization under the proposed bill.

Dr. REICHELDERFER. I will not repeat the justifications that Dr. Astin and Dr. Nolan and Mr. Miller have given, which apply equally well to the Weather Bureau. I would like to stress one or two points that I think are somewhat unique.

Meteorology, as a whole, the science of weather, has had difficulty in attracting topnotch scientists. There is a dearth of topnotch people throughout the world in this field. The field is becoming more important. Weather information, with greater industrialization, becomes more and more vital. With the possibilities that we hear now and then of weather control, at least to some degree, it becomes even greater in importance.

Weather is not only becoming more important, but some people think weather is becoming more erratic and we hear more about that in connection with atomic bombs and so forth. There are major problems awaiting scientific research and we have the greatest difficulty attracting and retaining well-qualified scientists.

This was brought out in an impartial objective way a few days ago by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences, where the difficulties of recruitment in meteorology were stressed and it was pointed out that perhaps there were two reasons and these both have a bearing on our justifications.

One is that the science does involve very extensive preparation. It involves an extensive knowledge of physics, an extensive knowledge of mathematics, more preparation than in many other fields.

The other is that meteorology has never attracted the salaries commensurate with the preparation and the importance that it has.

This request that we are making is a modest one. We are asking for only two positions under this category at the present titme, but it is a step in the right direction and I think a very important one.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REES. Are these two you are asking for already in your service?

Dr. REICHELDERFER. They are at the present time, yes; but we have some flexibility and the position we have not been able to fill at the top technical level we could fill if we could offer salaries of this kind, by recruitment from outside.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mr. GROSS. I have a question or two. I will ask this question of the gentleman at the end of the table who spoke of demands of private industry upon people in your Department. How do you expect to compete with private industry when many of these industries are operating on cost-plus contracts?

Dr. ASTIN. We do not expect to be able to compete with private industry but we would like to lessen the financial sacrifice which some of our people have to make by rejecting some of the attractive offers made to them.

Mr. GROSS. You are asking for what; 30?

Dr. ASTIN. Twenty-three for the National Bureau of Standards.

Mr. GROSS. Total for the Department of Commerce of how many?

Mr. HAYWARD. Thirty-five for the Department.

Mr. GROSS. How many do you now have?

Mr. HAYWARD. We do not have any of this type at the moment.

Mr. GROSS. Do you have any supergrade employees in the Department?

Mr. HAYWARD. Eighty-five.

Mr. GROSS. You have 85 now?

Mr. HAYWARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. You are asking for 35 more?

Mr. HAYWARD. These are 35 in the scientific and professional bracket, not really supergrades though the salaries are up in that range.

Mr. GROSS. I think we ought to know the total that you have and the total you are asking for.

Mr. HAYWARD. If you are speaking of supergrades we have 85 supergrades in the Department now.

Mr. GROSS. I see. Did you apply to the Civil Service Commission for unfilled spaces?

Mr. HAYWARD. Some of these, yes, sir, and as a matter of fact, two of the positions in the Bureau of Standards which would be affected by this proposed bill are already in that category—I believe grade 16.

Mr. GROSS. They have granted you some?

Mr. HAYWARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. If we grant these supergrades, you will be probably the top-paid Department in Government, would you not?

Mr. HAYWARD. I do not think so.

Mr. GROSS. According to a newspaper clipping I have here you will be.

Mr. HAYWARD. I think that newspaper article you read, sir, had reference to the Business and Defense Services Administration, which is a small bureau in the Department where we have mainly people from industry because that is the section where we have all these industrial divisions having to do with defense, material control, and that sort of thing.

Mr. GROSS. According to this clipping you now have 25 so-called supergrade employees.

Mr. HAYWARD. That is in BDSA.

Mr. GROSS. And you have 79 employees running from $11,600 to $7,500 to $8,600. You are going to do pretty well if you get these supergrade employees in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. HAYWARD. That is one small section of the Department, and I do not think you can use that to gage the entire Department. You can take the Bureau of the Census and you will find the average grade there is far below the Government average because we have quite a number of people in the lower grades in the Bureau of the Census whereas in this Business and Defense Services Administration you have quite a few people that are in high grades, high-level people. That particular area of the Department is not involved in these 35 positions we are talking about now.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. These 35, as I understand it, are not the same as the 85 supergrades you already have.

Mr. HAYWARD. That is correct.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. In other words, they are strictly scientific.

Mr. HAYWARD. And professional.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Yes, and professional people. All you are doing is putting them in the supergrade salary bracket in order to attract them and keep them?

Mr. HAYWARD. That is correct.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. But they cannot be mixed in with the 85 supergrades you now have?

Mr. HAYWARD. That is correct.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I must say I am in favor of that.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Hayward, is it your particular Department that these 35 positions are coming into?

Mr. HAYWARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOWDY. What sort of scientists do you need?

Mr. HAYWARD. Twenty-three of them are in the Bureau of Standards as Dr. Astin just talked about. Two of them are in the Weather Bureau, 5 in Civil Aeronautics Administration, and those 5 would be involved in technical and operational evaluation of navigation and traffic control equipment and systems and techniques and procedures to deal with the new type of aircraft.

Mr. DOWDY. Those two would be engineers, I presume, of some kind?

Mr. HAYWARD. Right. Then in Maritime we are asking for 3, 1 of them to work on nuclear power, 1 to work on undersea warfare and amphibious operations, and another to work on merchant ship design.

Mr. DOWDY. That is five.

Mr. HAYWARD. Now the 23 in the Bureau of Standards involve mainly positions in the scientific field.

Mr. DOWDY. What sciences?

Mr. ASTIN. That would cover all of the major physical sciences and branches of engineering. For example, included would be atomic and radiation physicists and optical physicists, electrical physicists, mathematicians, chemists in various categories, electronic and radio engineers.

Mr. DOWDY. That makes 28. What are the other 7? I guess those 28 positions consist of 2 grade 16 supergrades and 26 grade 15's?

Mr. HAYWARD. That is correct.

Mr. DOWDY. What will the other seven be?

Mr. HAYWARD. You have 5 in CAA, 3 in Maritime, 2 in Weather, and 2 in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. DOWDY. Now, you run more than 35.

Mr. HAYWARD. I do not think so. Twenty-three are in Standards.

Mr. DOWDY. I have 5 engineers and 23 scientists that you need so far. That leaves seven positions.

Mr. HAYWARD. Total of 23 in the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. DOWDY. That is 23 and 3 in——

Mr. HAYWARD. Three in Maritime, five in CAA——

Mr. DOWDY. Five in CAA. What is that?

Mr. HAYWARD. That is navigation and traffic control engineers.

Mr. DOWDY. More enginers?

Mr. HAYWARD. That is right.

Mr. DOWDY. What is the rest?

Mr. HAYWARD. You have 2 in Weather and 2 in Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. DOWDY. Two in Weather would be scientists?

Mr. HAYWARD. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. Dr. Astin, last year out of 17 what was the classification of the 17 that you mentioned along with the 5 associate directors? You said you had 9 vacancies in that group last year.

Dr. ASTIN. During the past 2 years approximately.

Mr. DAVIS. Two years?

Dr. ASTIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. What were the classifications of the 17 that you mentioned?

Dr. ASTIN. All GS–15's.

Mr. DAVIS. How did those vacancies occur? Did they occur through resignation or retirement or just how, of the nine?

Dr. ASTIN. Some occurred through resignation, some retirement, and some through reorganizational problems.

Mr. DAVIS. Can you tell us how the various vacancies arose? Do you have that at your fingertips?

Dr. ASTIN. Yes, sir. Three arose through resignation——

Mr. DAVIS. Where did those three go when they resigned? Did they go to private industry?

Dr. ASTIN. I think 2 went to industry and 1 to a university. Then there were two retirements.

Mr. DAVIS. Do you know if they got more salary where they went when they resigned?

Dr. ASTIN. It is definitely my understanding that they did. I am not aware of the specific salaries these individuals obtained.

Mr. RHODES. Were they asked to resign?

Dr. ASTIN. No.

Mr. RHODES. Resignations forced upon them? The three that resigned, did they resign by request?

Mr. REES. Did you demand their resignation?

Dr. ASTIN. No.

(Upon review it is clear that 3 years ago, one resignation was sought and received for the vacancies under discussion.)

Mr. DAVIS. How many of them—that is the 3 of the 9—how many vacancies occurred through retirement or death?

Dr. ASTIN. Just two.

Mr. DAVIS. You said you moved up some of the lower grade people into some of these vacancies. How did you fill the others?

Dr. ASTIN. The others were filled by transfer within the organization. We found someone in another organizational unit who appeared to have the qualifications to fill the vacancy quite adequately.

Mr. DAVIS. You did not hire any of them from outside?

Dr. ASTIN. In most of these categories we made an effort to hire from outside. In only one vacancy did we hire from outside. This was a transfer from another Government agency.

Mr. DAVIS. The others you filled in by transfer?

Dr. ASTIN. Yes; either from direct promotion straight up or from horizontal transfer.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Hayward, do you feel that the method we are using here of coming in department by department and agency by agency and asking for a fixed number of positions in salary levels of public law 313 is going to solve your problems?

Mr. HAYWARD. I do not think it will solve the whole problem but I think we have to get our foot in the door some time and get something started.

Mr. MOSS. Would it not be a better procedure to have a separate schedule for personnel of this type that recognizes the current competitive factors in not only recruiting but retaining them in Government service?

Mr. HAYWARD. I am not an expert on anything like that. I think probably a separate category would be a good thing but I believe the Civil Service Commission would be better able to speak on that.

Mr. MOSS. I notice you are the Director of the Office of Personnel Management in the Department of Commerce and I would assume you had some competence in the field.

Mr. HAYWARD. I do, but I do not want to make a comment on national policy that I think should come from Civil Service.

Mr. MOSS. I was asking for a personal expression.

Mr. HAYWARD. My personal feeling is yes, it would probably be a great help.

Mr. MOSS. Is the $15,000 salary going to take you sufficiently into the types of salaries paid by competition to materially improve your position?

Mr. HAYWARD. I think it will, because of the fact that there is a little bit of feeling on the part of people in the Government that there may be a little better security in the Government. I think some people have the feeling that the present situation in industry may decline later and that may help us to keep them in the Government at a level of $15,000.

Mr. MOSS. Dr. Astin, do you have any views on that?

Dr. ASTIN. Well, the solution to this problem, which is basically one of critical shortage of scientists and engineers, I do not see at least in the near future, but our ability to pay the higher salaries which this proposed legislation would authorize would certainly reduce some of the criticality of the present situation. I do not think it is the ultimate solution and I am not sure what the ultimate solution is.

Mr. MOSS. What problems do you have now in recruiting the younger scientists into the work of the Bureau of Standards?

Dr. ASTIN. It is a difficult problem and part of it is the fact that the entrance salaries are below the average that industry can now

pay. Part of it is due to the fact that some of the younger people are discouraged by the promotional opportunities and having an increase in the current ceiling, of course, will help in that direction.

Mr. Moss. If you also had an increase in the entrance grades, it would be of value to you?

Dr. ASTIN. It would help very much in the recruiting problem; yes.

Mr. Moss. Thank you.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Hayward, of these 35 new positions would they be filled with personnel that is now in the Department?

Mr. HAYWARD. Twenty-eight would, 7 would be in new positions presumably filled from the outside.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The ones that you have in the Department, would their positions be filled by other people lower than they are now?

Mr. HAYWARD. Presumably.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Does this mean that the existing positions would be eliminated as the new positions are established? I believe that is the statement under the supergrades by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. HAYWARD. If these people were simply staying in the position they are in now and their salaries increased, there would be no vacancy, nobody would move up.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thought you said 28 of them would be moved up?

Mr. HAYWARD. I created the wrong impression then. I cannot move anybody into the job unless there is a vacancy.

Mr. ALEXANDER. You are helping the 28 people, then, and not solving the problem of the Department.

Mr. HAYWARD. I think we are solving it in this way: That, if we do not do something for that group of 28, we will lose some of them.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

We will next hear from Chairman Philip Young, of the Civil Service Commission.

STATEMENTS OF HON. PHILIP YOUNG, CHAIRMAN, CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION; HON. GEORGE M. MOORE, COMMISSIONER; JOHN W. MACY, JR., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR; AND FRANK J. BARLEY, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF INSPECTIONS AND CLASSIFICATION AUDITS

Mr. YOUNG. I do not have a prepared statement this morning. I have brought with me the report of the Civil Service Commission on H. R. 11040, which I will provide. This report of the Commission, of course, supports the provisions and the purposes and objectives of H. R. 11040. We are 100 percent in support of the Department of Commerce and Department of the Interior position as well as the other parts of this bill; and in the interests of time, perhaps Mr. Chairman, I might read just the last two paragraphs of the last page.

Since the legislative proposal was submitted to you on February 10, 1956, a further review of the requirements for research and development programs in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Departments of Interior and Commerce has evidenced a need for additional top-level scientific positions in the technical activities of those organizations. The number of such positions was determined on the basis of planned research programs in these agencies. The legislative requests submitted for these agencies are incorporated in H. R. 11040. The Commission fully supports these additional scientific positions as authorized in your bill.

The provisions of this bill do not alter the supergrade authorization in the Classification Act as amended by Public Law 94 last year. A total of 1,200 positions will continue to be available for allocation and distribution by majority of the Commission to all departments and agencies other than the Department of Defense. Since 269 positions are currently authorized to the Department of Defense within the 1,200 total, that number would become available for redistribution to other departments and agencies under this bill. The Commission would propose to distribute these positions to meet current agency needs which already exceed the number of positions which would become available. By such action it would be possible to avoid requests for additional special authority for positions of this type in other legislative proposals and appropriation riders. The Commission strongly backs the position taken by your committee in opposing such separate authority and in urging continued consolidation of all supergrade authorizations other than those of the Department of Defense in this single statute. Therefore, the Commission endorses and urges a favorable consideration and enactment of H. R. 11040.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, this memorandum that you have distributed to the committee shows that out of the 1,200 supergrades authorized you now have 22 in reserve; that appointments have not been made to the 22 positions.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And that through the Defense authority under this bill 269 supergrade positions which Defense has had will be returned to the Commission for allocation; is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to know the justification for the additions.

Mr. YOUNG. It works out this way. At the present time we have agency requests on hand for 512 supergrade positions and I would like to make it clear to the committee that we are now talking about supergrade positions and not talking about Public Law 313 scientific jobs around which the discussion this morning centered so far. These are actual supergrade requests.

Seventy of those have been carefully evaluated and analyzed and warrant immediate allocation. Our experience has indicated over the last few years that of the remaining 442—that is, the 512 minus the 70—that probably 50 percent of those, or 221, will ultimately be authorized and be qualified after going through this very careful and detailed screening evaluation as supergrades.

Now, section 4 (a) 1 of H. R. 11040 cancels authority for three supergrades for the Bureau of Prisons. I would like to add that to our requirements here. Pending legislation which is now before the Congress provides for an additional 45 supergrades to be authorized. This is excluding, of course, the Department of Defense requirements.

At this point I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the very spirited attack you made on this appropriation authority for the General Services Administration to secure some of these supergrades via the back door route. I am sorry that it could not be stopped in the House.

But that is the type of thing going on. Here are 45 additional ones already in pending bills completely outside of the control and jurisdiction of this committee.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think it will be stopped in the other body?

Mr. YOUNG. Both the Administrator for General Services Administration and Chairman of the Civil Service Commission testified they

did not want that authority in the appropriation act in the Senate. I cite this pending legislation because you have this tremendous pressure, of course, from all the departments and agencies to circumvent the supergrade ceilings any possible way, whether by going to their own substantive committees or through the appropriation route by a rider. That, of course, violates the understanding and agreement which the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget have had with you, Mr. Chairman, and this committee for the last year to try to get this whole supergrade authority into 1 basket under 1 control where it can be reviewed and handled in a realistic and objective fashion. So that actually these 45 which are now pending in other bills should be knocked out in my opinion and should come out of this 269 supergrades which would be returned for allocation under 11040.

Now, in addition to the requirements up to this point, there are existing current authorities for 19 supergrades which are already in existence, which so far have not been consolidated along with the Classification Act total of 1,200. Most of those supergrades already authorized are in the Small Business Administration, which accounts for 15 out of 19 scattered ones authorized in other legislation.

Again following up policy we developed on this joint cooperative basis last year of getting these all in one basket, it is my feeling those should be brought in under these 269 allotments which would be recaptured under 11040.

Now, if you add those items together, which to my mind is a pretty objective and realistic basis, we come up with a total estimated current requirement of 358 supergrades at this particular point of time. There is no telling what will happen tomorrow in any of these other programs which figure in the security and defense picture, but at the moment we have a requirement of 358 including bringing into this one basket the now extraneous supergrades which are outside of it and we would have available, if H. R. 11040 were enacted, 269 to meet that requirement.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Young, is it not a fact that Executive Order 10450 of 1953 has been the biggest detriment to the Federal Government in hiring and maintaining personnel in the Federal Government?

Mr. YOUNG. The biggest what?

Mr. LESINSKI. Detriment in maintaining proper personnel and recruiting personnel.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not think so.

Mr. LESINSKI. Evidently the gentleman does not read the reports and is not aware of what is going on in his own Department.

Mr. YOUNG. Our experience last fall and this winter in initiating this Federal Service entrance examination, during the course of which we consolidated over 100 examinations into one and designed primarily for college graduates and persons of college caliber, we visited either directly or through our representatives over 900 campuses around the country because, of course, our great intake is in about the 24-age-level bracket in the Government service.

We could find no evidence, no real evidence at all, that the Government security program was in any way having a detrimental effect on that major source of recruitment of talented younger people.

Mr. LESINSKI. They do not know what is going on and are not aware of what happened in the past?

Mr. YOUNG. I have had great admiration and respect for our college graduates. They are keenly aware of what is going on.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Macy?

Mr. MACY. I have nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Moore?

Mr. MOORE. I have nothing.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What would be the total of these supergrades together with all of the scientific and others we have had if this bill were passed?

Mr. YOUNG. You start out with the 1,200 authorized under the Classification Act. You add on 113 now in these extraneous authorities outside of the classification, making 1,313. You add on the provisions in this bill of 285 for the Department of Defense. Then that would give the total supergrades allocation Governmentwide of 1,598 total number of supergrades. Then you add to that the number which you have of PL–313 scientific and professional positions, which is a total of 380.

Mr. ALEXANDER. How many other departments will come in and request the same type of treatment under this bill that we can look forward to having within the next few months?

Mr. YOUNG. We tried to consolidate in this one proposal the needs of the executive branch so far as we could determine them at this time. This is always a fluid situation. I do not know what will happen tomorrow.

Mr. ALEXANDER. You do not intend now to come in and recommend other departments?

Mr. YOUNG. As far as I am concerned this represents the request from the executive branch as far as we know, what the requirements are today for the departments and agencies for these PL–313 positions, and while we cannot meet our estimated requirements on the supergrade positions, I think this will meet enough of the situation so that we can carry on in an orderly and efficient fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

Mr. REES. Mr. Moore spent considerable time on the other side of the table as general counsel for this committee. I would ask him if he feels now, on the other side of the table, if these requests here this morning by these agencies are justified?

Mr. MOORE. I believe that the approval of this legislation will help this committee. I sincerely feel that the position that this committee and all members of this committee have taken with respect to the inroads on riders on appropriation bills is something that was recognized by the chairman when he introduced this bill and I believe that this legislation, as proposed, if enacted will certainly solidify the policy of your committee.

Mr. REES. Thank you.

Mr. CRETELLA. What is the salary of these supregrades?

Mr. YOUNG. $14,800 is the rate for grade 18 at the present time. Grade 17 is $13,975 at the first step of the grade. Grade 16 is $12,900 at the first step of the grade.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Young, for the record, did the General Services Administration request the super jobs which were put into the appropriation bill?

Mr. YOUNG. They certainly were never approved officially either by the Civil Service Commission as a request or the Bureau of the Budget, that I know of.

Mr. GROSS. Did they request these supergrade jobs from the Civil Service Commission? Was request made for the 11 supergrade jobs?

Mr. YOUNG. My recollection is not for the particular jobs which were requested in the appropriation act.

Mr. GROSS. And the Civil Service Commission denied the request, is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. For other jobs, not for the same jobs.

Mr. GROSS. For the jobs?

Mr. YOUNG. Which jobs? The Civil Service Commission did not receive any request for the specific jobs which they asked for or which were put into their appropriation rider.

Mr. GROSS. They never made the request?

Mr. YOUNG. They asked for different jobs.

Mr. GROSS. I do want to commend the chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the members for appearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee in opposition to that back-door method.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Young, it is a fact, then, that the Civil Service Commission was literally bypassed in this procedure?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct and also the Bureau of the Budget.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. In other words, you were never asked, you never had the request?

Mr. YOUNG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the Bureau of Immigration positions which were authorized by the Appropriations Committee in which the House, by a close vote, approved? Were those positions requested by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Immigration?

Mr. YOUNG. We were not asked for those and, of course, we strongly objected when we heard about it. Those two things I think are good examples of the pressures under which we are constantly laboring and with 45 of them still having escaped us in pending bills, it merely adds to this indication of the pressures that exist and it would be my feeling with the recapture and reallocation of these 269 that we could still buck that pressure and withstand it and keep these supergrades under the control of this committee where they ought to be.

Otherwise, I am not sure what we can do in the Commission or in the Bureau of the Budget to keep these departments and agencies from trying every back-door method of meeting their needs by other means.

The CHAIRMAN. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Young, you mentioned in your statement that you and the head of GSA had appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee to oppose that group of supergrades. Would you care to say whether you plan to appear before the Senate Committee to oppose these supergrades that the Commissioner of Immigration asked for and that was in the bill the chairman just mentioned?

Mr. YOUNG. I have not been asked to. My opposition in the GSA instance came up as a part of our regular testimony for the Civil Service Commission because we are in the same appropriation act. It came up in that connection.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to express the hope that you would appear in opposition to these supergrades put in in Mr. Rooney's subcommittee for the Bureau of Immigration.

Mr. YOUNG. I would object if I had the opportunity. I see no reason why we could not write them a letter and tell them our feeling because I think it is so terribly important that this whole supergrade area be under the control of the Civil Service Committees.

Mr. DAVIS. I thoroughly agree and I hope you will see fit to write them a letter and appear, also.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

Mr. MOSS. I have questions, but time will not permit me to ask them. There is a rollcall.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 11:12 a. m., Thursday, May 10, the hearing was adjourned to reconvene at 10 a. m., Friday, May 11, 1956.)

SCIENTIFIC, PROFESSIONAL, AND ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS TO PROMOTE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

FRIDAY, MAY 11, 1956

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a. m., in room 213, Old House Office Building, Hon. Tom Murray (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order, and the hearing is resumed on H. R. 11040.

At the conclusion of the meeting yesterday, Chairman Philip Young of the Civil Service Commission was still testifying and Mr. Moss had the floor to question him. Mr. Moss.

Mr. Moss. Mr. Young, I am interested in your opinion as to the soundness of the approach we are presently using of authorizing in special legislation additional positions to permit us to retain in the employ of the Government the type of professional personnel we require in scientific research and development.

Would we not be better off to have a clear-cut program, recognizing the problems of employment of this type of personnel as continuing problems, and also giving greater recognition to the problems of recruiting this type of personnel?

STATEMENTS OF HON. PHILIP YOUNG, CHAIRMAN, CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION; HON GEORGE M. MOORE, COMMISSIONER; AND JOHN W. MACY, JR., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR—Resumed

Mr. YOUNG. I think that we have the shortage, as we all recognize and difficulties in recruiting and retaining scientific personnel. That is the basic problem, of course, which is confronting not only the Government but everybody today as far as that is concerned. I think we would all agree there is no immediate solution to it in terms of increase in numbers of qualified people.

I think, with an increasing awareness of the problem, that both Government and industry has been taking steps to alleviate it so far as they can in terms of, let us say, not stockpiling talent which is not being used properly. Steps have been taken toward greater utilization, for example, of technically trained people, but people who may not be in the advanced category of scientists or engineers.

I think that some indirect stockpiling practices which have been engaged in from time to time such as using scientists or engineers for some post or some capacity other than that for which he might be best qualified is being eliminated to a large extent.

So that from the point of view of alleviating the shortage and capitalizing the most you can on the available talent, I think that is gradually being done.

As far as the Government goes, the problem is, I think, basically one of retention, largely retention, rather than recruitment. It has a number of indirect effects which are very difficult to deal with because in many of the scientific programs of the Government—and the same thing is true, of course, in industry—much of the advanced scientific work is done by teams of scientists of 2 or 3 or even 5 working together complementing each other in these highly complex scientific areas, and the longer they work together the more productive their work becomes as a group.

Where you get into trouble is if one man of the team leaves, instead of just losing the services of one individual as we normally think of it, you lose the productive capacity of that group because it might take years to train a new team member into the group in that particular area to catch up on their scientific research. It also has a psychological impact on the other members of the team that are left wondering what they ought to do so that you have a serious problem from that point of view.

Mr. Moss. Do you not also, in that matter of teamwork, when you lose a man from the team frequently lose a team service to the Government because that man going with another employer may well seek to recruit those he is accustomed to work with?

Mr. YOUNG. That is normal if they are going to work in the same area and on the same type of project, I think that is true. Even if the team does not leave the remaining members of the team, of course, their work is stymied to some extent until they can replace the team member.

Mr. Moss. You stated that retention was the immediate problem, not so much that of recruitment. I recall Congressman Gubser recited an example in his district at Sunnyvale, where the large laboratory of the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics operates, that recently in recruiting new personnel they succeeded only in attracting people from the lower third of the graduates available to them because of the inadequate salaries.

Is that not a problem, if we are not able to attract from the upper categories of graduates, if we are only going to get the less desirable personnel?

Mr. YOUNG. You want the best people you can get but your top scientists in the Government, from my observation, have largely been developed by the Government. They have come in in the lower grades and gradually built up and that is one of the reasons why; it is such a loss when they leave the Government service.

We bring in very few people in the higher grades of scientists, persons already fully developed. They are built up in the Government, trained in the Government, and become a part of the whole Government operation.

As to whether a person in the lower third of his particular class who is recruited into the Government is going to turn out to be an inferior scientist 10 years from now in some aspect of a particular field, I do not know.

Mr. Moss. Is the $15,000 ceiling going to encourage retention of our best men as effectively as a more realistic ceiling of, say, $17,500?

Mr. YOUNG. No, I think this committee has already recognized that when it passed the executive pay provisions last summer. But unfortunately that has not yet been passed by the Senate in any form because as you know that would provide for the $17,500 rating for the PL–313 scientific and professional groups.

So that it would help a great deal if that could be enacted at this session; there is no question about it.

On the other hand, Mr. Moss, this question of salary I do not think is entirely the answer, it cannot be the sole answer or the basic answer necessarily to retaining these people in the Government. You have this situation where the Government is competing with itself at the present time because many of these people, of course, who go to private industry are going on to Government contracts and indirectly, anyway, being financed with Government funds.

You have that kind of a difficult situation to contend with. So that it is difficult to say whether the Government loses the services of the man in the long run. It may cost more money and perhaps in some instances not the best way, perhaps it should be done in the Government service rather than on a contract basis.

Mr. Moss. Is it not a direct competition? If we cannot recruit personnel for a given project, we will probably let it on contract?

Mr. YOUNG. That is right.

Mr. Moss. There is no ceiling on what the contractor can pay. He can afford to go out and use any inducement necessary to pick up outstanding men in the particular field.

Mr. YOUNG. And probably financed by the Government.

Mr. Moss. There is a salary plus profit and plus management charge in addition, so that while we get the benefit of the services of the man, it is at a much higher figure than if we were paying a more realistic salary while they are on the Government payroll.

Mr. YOUNG. I think that is correct; yes. I agree. We still get the benefit of his services but perhaps it is doing it the hard way and perhaps not the best way. It may be best to do it on contract.

Mr. Moss. Should we not have a program for people in technical categories, not picking up 35 jobs here or there when the pressure becomes too great, but recognizing the need for a constant program for personnel of this type: one with a higher starting salary and one with higher ceilings than is presently contained in the general schedule of positions?

Mr. YOUNG. My feeling would be you do not need to sort them out into a special isolated or distinct kind of a program. It represents a personnel-management problem as far as the Government is concerned, and the pay levels are now pending before Congress which I think would help some, but the Government pay scale on scientists and engineers, so far as I know, is never going to be any more comparable with industry than Government pay scales in other occupations in the top brackets is going to be comparable; and, if the pay scale were raised to $17,500, you will still have a pay problem in terms of retaining your people solely on the basis of pay because industry can afford to pay more and if they really want that particular individual in this shortage group, they are going to pay more. I do not think raising the pay $2,500 is going to solve that problem.

Mr. Moss. I think the Director of the Advisory Committee on Aeronautics testified that if Government paid within 20 percent of indus-

try, it would have no problem generally in retaining men in Government service, but it is when the differential exceeds 20 percent that we run into real problems.

Mr. YOUNG. I just do not believe it.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOSS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. You just said you did not think raising the salary $2,500 would solve the problem. Do you think there is any solution for it; and if so, what is your thought about what the solution is?

Mr. YOUNG. I have no patent solution to offer, Congressman. It is a problem which can only work itself out over time. I think the personnel-management program in the Government for scientists and engineers can constantly be improved and we are working on that to see what we can do. You have a variety of groups in the executive branch working on all aspects of this scientist problem, from starting with the high-school level of education right on through and including the utilization of these people, so that every precaution, presumably, that can be taken will be taken to safeguard the security and defense of the country in terms of having this kind of talent available where it is needed and when.

Mr. DAVIS. Industry has that same kind of program, do they not, of keeping their eyes on the high school and college students and getting in there to recruit them?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, but this is in addition to that. I am not just thinking of recruiting. I am thinking of what can be done to stimulate the potential talents in going into these fields and getting them through as rapidly as possible so they are still competently trained, speed up the whole process to get a larger number in order to alleviate this shortage problem. That is both short-range and long-range program and a lot of work is being done on that. Of course, there is also a lot of thought and study being given to this contract problem. I mean how do you determine what you are going to contract out and how do you determine what you are going to do yourself directly within a Government Bureau or Department?

Mr. DAVIS. I was interested as you have been talking in that very thing, if Mr. Moss will yield further. Has it been broken down, do you know, or is it pretty well known how much money is being spent in this country on research and what portion is being spent by private industry and what portion is being spent by the Government?

Mr. YOUNG. I have no idea.

Mr. DAVIS. I have been reading a lot of speeches and articles recently on that very thing. Some people say the amount being spent each year runs around $5 billion, private industry, that is. I was just wondering how the amount which is being spent by the Government compares with the amount being spent by private industry on research.

Mr. YOUNG. I could not tell you, sir. I have no basis for knowing and I think perhaps the Bureau of the Budget may have some idea on it.

Mr. DAVIS. There has been a lot of talk recently, also, that the Soviets or the Communists are outstripping us considerably in the number of graduate engineers and research scientists. Of course, they have an advantage over us. They can put their graduates wherever they want them and we cannot do that. They can go in private in-

dustry if they choose or come with the Government if they choose. But there seems to have been quite a bit of apprehension recently that they are outstripping us in the number of scientific and research scientists who are being graduated each year. For instance, 1 man said there are 63,000 graduate engineers in Russia this year compared with 23,000 in America. Of course, if they are outstripping us that way they are really getting ahead of us.

Mr. YOUNG. I would like to see some appraisal of quality as well as numbers. These terms we use, scientists and engineers, cover a multitude of sins.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you.

Mr. YOUNG. A top scientist is sort of like a top espionage agent. It does not take many to get the job done.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not true the salary the Government pays would have some bearing as an inducement on encouraging people into the scientific fields as they go into college or universities?

Mr. YOUNG. I do not think the Government salary would have very much impact on that because the salary levels are so high and there is such demand on the part of industry and everyone in the colleges and high schools and universities knows about it and whether you raise the Government salary $2,500 or not I do not think it would be much of an inducement to a chap to specialize in the scientific field for that purpose.

Mr. MOSS. I am interested in your reaction because in another committee recently we had a panel of 12 very distinguished scientists before us. I took the occasion to discuss this problem with them in some detail. It was the feeling almost unanimously—and I make that reservation only because of an abundance of caution, I cannot recall a single dissent—that we needed the separate schedule and that the higher levels in Government service would constitute an inducement and these were not men who are in the minor leagues at all. They are in the very top echelons in science here in this country. That seemed to be their considered judgment, a number of them very active in educational institutions who have participated in some surveys to determine the attitudes of the young men coming into scientific fields, and they felt very strongly on this point that the two things would have an important bearing of a most constructive nature on this problem of inducing more people into science and more people in scientific fields into Government employ.

Mr. YOUNG. Certainly any increase in salary level is going to help the Government recruitment problem. I agree with that even if you bring them in at a lower grade because they see a longer career and a chance to get to a higher bracket eventually if they stay with it. That would be true of every career opportunity in Government and not just limited to scientists or engineers.

But with the going levels of pay which industry is offering to college graduates and graduates of graduate schools in the scientific schools today the fact that you would pay $2,500 more eventually in the Government service for a scientist I think would have very little impact in terms of making up the mind of a high school student whether he will specialize in science or engineering in college. That is my reaction.

Mr. MOSS. Would it have an effect on the man who is looking for more of a career type opportunity?

Mr. YOUNG. Those boys are primarily looking for how much money they can get and get through with their military service and get married rather than the long-range security of a career in that age level, from my observation as a former school administrator.

Mr. MOSS. That was an observation, I again point out, not borne out by my discussions with this group and we had them from a number of universities.

Mr. YOUNG. That is my feeling.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask a question or two.

This bill deals with "professional or scientific." I wonder if you could define who would come under "professional" just a little more explicitly. We have been talking about scientific personnel almost exclusively. Could we have a better definition of the category of those who would come under "professional"?

Mr. YOUNG. The professional people would be your engineers and physical scientists. We are not using "professional" in the sense of lawyer or businessman. It is technical professions or scientific professions, engineering, like the personnel you find in the NACA and those agencies.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the Civil Service Commission has ever made inquiry of any kind into the "featherbedding" that was going on 2 or 3 years ago in Defense Establishments with respect to particularly engineers? That is the employment of more engineers than they could possible use.

Mr. YOUNG. That is what everybody has tried to do in order to stockpile talent if they could, both in Government and outside of Government. I do not think there is much of that going on today so far as I am aware. Perhaps Mr. Moore or Mr. Macy might have some comment on that. I think just the sheer critical nature of the shortage has stopped it.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we will have a shortage. I would be pleased to hear from Mr. Macy or Mr. Moore if they have information, but the shortage could be attributed a few years ago to a form of featherbedding particularly in defense plants operating under cost-plus contracts. I wonder if that is going on today. I raised the question before but I do not believe before you gentlemen of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Gross, we would not have any review responsibility for contractor operations under the Defense Department, but in the direct Government operation in defense it has been our observation that the three military departments are making a conscientious effort to utilize technical and scientific skills to the fullest possible degree. I do not recall any of our reports or any of our discussions with representatives of those departments indicating any featherbedding or duplication of scientific talent. I am sure if we found it or if the management of the Defense Department found it they would move promptly to correct the situation.

Mr. GROSS. It did exist and on a rather large scale some time ago. I hope it is not true today, but it did exist and no one apparently did anything about it at that time.

Mr. YOUNG. I think that situation has been corrected, Mr. Gross. If you know of any instances we would like to know of them.

Mr. GROSS. I do not today.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not, either.

Mr. GROSS. But if the Civil Service Commission has an opportunity I would hope they would at least make some casual inquiry to ascertain if it is still going on.

In some of these appropriation bills which have been before the House on which points of order were waived we have had the language in the bill apparently suspending the Classification Act—"notwithstanding the provisions of the Classification Act" and so on and so forth.

I regret I have not made inquiry before as to exactly what they mean by that.

Mr. YOUNG. I am not sure what bill you are referring to.

Mr. MACY. I believe, Mr. Gross, that the reference there is to an exemption of those particular positions from the ceiling limitation in the Classification Act on number of supergrades.

Mr. GROSS. In point of numbers.

Mr. MACY. Yes, sir; and in some cases in point of the Commission exercising a review as to whether the particular positions warranted allocation at a supergrade level. That was true in the two riders that have been before the House so far this session, the rider with respect to GSA and with respect to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. As Chairman Young indicated yesterday, the Commission's view is one of strong opposition to that type of approach in obtaining additional supergrade positions.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but I was trying to satisfy my curiosity as to how far reaching that sort of language goes in an appropriation bill or any bill for that matter. Yesterday the Secretary of Defense, through the appropriation bill, obtained $82.5 million that can very largely be spent upon his own account. I do not suppose there is any way by which he can go ahead and pay higher salaries to those in his Department of Defense?

Mr. YOUNG. No; he would still be governed by the salary ceilings and the classification provisions.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Young, does this bill here, 11040, bring all of the supergrades under one ceiling now?

Mr. YOUNG. There are still a few exceptions. What it does do is it specifically provides for bringing in 3 from the Bureau of Prisons in the bill and in addition we would use the supergrades which we retain under the provisions of this bill, we hope, to cover 19 supergrades which now are authorized by 4 other laws outside of the Classification Act. It does not cover the supergrades for the Library of Congress, General Accounting Office, and Federal Bureau of Investigation, which at the present time add up to 91.

Mr. DOWDY. How many altogether of supergrade positions will there be?

Mr. YOUNG. Total number?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. I will be glad to give you that.

Mr. DOWDY. It may have been given yesterday, but I am not clear about it.

The CHAIRMAN. You furnished a memo, Mr. Young, showing supergrade.

Mr. DOWDY. I had it but I cannot understand how many there will be.

The CHAIRMAN. You keep the same ceiling, I believe.

Mr. DOWDY. This bill creates 200——

Mr. YOUNG. Two hundred and eighty-five for Defense. At the present time there are 1,313 altogether, 1,200 in the present Classification Act plus these miscellaneous authorities.

Mr. DOWDY. This bill, then, creates in addition to that some more?

Mr. YOUNG. Two hundred and eighty-five for the Department of Defense making it a total of 1,598.

Mr. DOWDY. What will happen in Commerce? There will be left open how many?

Mr. YOUNG. Thirty-five.

Mr. DOWDY. It will open up 28 more supergrades. Will you leave them vacant? Twenty-some-odd of them are in grade 15 and only 2 or 3 in grade 16.

Will that create two new jobs there?

Mr. YOUNG. It is hard to tell at this point. We may recapture 1 or 2 from Commerce if they use these 313 jobs provided by this bill the way they should be used. I think one of the difficulties we got into yesterday, perhaps not a difficulty but to clarify the picture, the 313 jobs are used for a different type of position than the supergrade jobs as this committee set them up in 1947 or 1948, I think was the time, but what has happened because of the ceiling on the 313 jobs and the fact that you had more supergrade jobs than 313 jobs you tended to put people who should have been 313 jobs in supergrades and that is one of the situations we are trying to clear up and keep just as clear as we can.

Mr. DOWDY. There was an ambiguity in the testimony yesterday, to me at least. Mr. Hayward said there would not be a great deal of increase in cost at Commerce because the 28 jobs were going to be transferred from the general schedule to the scientific schedule; and then, upon questioning by someone, he said probably the grades they presently hold will be refilled by somebody else. In other words, vacancies created by moving them into another field would be vacancies that would be refilled.

Do you know which will actually happen, whether there will be just this slight increase in the salaries to those men or will it be creating 28 new jobs that will be filled?

Mr. YOUNG. I think in most instances you will tend to have a movement up the scale in that particular section or division in a number of these.

Mr. DOWDY. So the justification or the cost shown here at bottom of this sheet of cost data the Secretary sent over, he says "Creation of these scientific category jobs will cost $151,380," and in setting that up he is deducting the salaries paid to 2 GS–16's and 26 GS–15's which are going to be transferred to the scientific category. If they do not refill those jobs it will cost Commerce $151,000 but if they do refill those jobs it will cost practically twice that much.

Mr. YOUNG. It would depend on whether they are promoting somebody from within so you have a net cost of the increase.

Mr. DOWDY. If you promote somebody from within you promote somebody else.

Mr. YOUNG. You might abolish the job at the bottom of the ladder.

Mr. DOWDY. Does this bill 11040 bring all of these supergrade positions under the supervision of your Commission so you can decide whether the grades are justified and, if not, give a lesser grade and, if not, why not?

Mr. YOUNG. Except for those three agencies I mentioned, Library of Congress, GAO, and FBI, which are still outside of this control——

Mr. DOWDY. Why should they be?

Mr. YOUNG. That is what this committee decided.

Mr. DOWDY. Do you think it is right or wrong? Should they all not be under supervision of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. YOUNG. I think from the point of view of the general principles of administration certainly the agencies in the executive branch, which would eliminate the Library of Congress and GAO, I think should probably be under the same administrative provisions. There are special situations and conditions in the FBI which may warrant that exception. So that the FBI category does not disturb me in terms of its being outside of the present umbrella.

But on these other jobs, your question is a very important question, the Civil Service Commission, even under these new supergrades provided for Defense, still has to pass on the evaluation of the position to see whether or not it warrants a supergrade and it also passes, of course, on the qualifications of the individual where those positions are under the civil-service system.

Mr. DOWDY. Is there some provision in this bill which would bring jobs created by the Appropriations Committee under that same authority of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. YOUNG. No, there is not.

Mr. DOWDY. Do you not think there should be?

Mr. YOUNG. I am in favor of doing anything which will strengthen the control of this committee over the supergrades which are enacted into law and for which this committee holds the Commission responsible for the administration.

Mr. DOWDY. I do not know, for instance, whether the positions in these two appropriation bills and in this bill will be left in in the Senate or not or whether they will finally wind up being created in the appropriation bill, but do you not think you should prepare for us some sort of amendment to go into this bill which would bring them under your supervision and control in the event they or any other similar jobs are created?

Mr. YOUNG. I just do not know how you go about having one committee of Congress trying to control what the other committee can do by legislation. Perhaps Mr. Moore can say.

Mr. DOWDY. I am trying to give you the authority to supervise those jobs whenever they are created if they are.

Mr. MOORE. Do I understand, Mr. Dowdy, what you propose is that the limitation of 1,200 shall apply to not only the positions that are provided for in 11040 but also those provided for by riders to appropriation bills?

Mr. DOWDY. That is right, as well as supervision of whether they are justified after they are authorized or whether the person who is appointed is properly qualified to have the higher grade.

Mr. MOORE. Provisions of the Classification Act to apply to those as well as these?

Mr. DOWDY. That is right. Do you not think you ought to have that authority?

Mr. YOUNG. Whether or not the appropriations committee increased the total number you are saying that those positions should still come under the control of the Civil Service Commission in terms of evaluation and qualifications of incumbents, and so forth?

Mr. DOWDY. That is right.

Mr. YOUNG. I would think that might be helpful. It does not solve the ceiling problem, of course, but maybe there is no help for that.

Mr. DOWDY. I believe we should think about something in this field to bring them under your control.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mr. ROBESON. I would like to go back to this recruitment problem a minute. You need not get into all the details of it, but apparently you said, I understood that they are having trouble recruiting people and industry recruits them and you cannot recruit them; is that right?

Mr. YOUNG. I think everybody is having trouble on recruiting in this particular scientific and engineering category.

Mr. ROBESON. But you are concerned with the Government's program?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; we have trouble along with everybody else.

Mr. ROBESON. Does each outfit have its own recruiting methods and procedures or is there an overall Government recruitment for technical and engineering people?

Mr. YOUNG. Of course, the examining process of the Civil Service Commission is the basic recruitment system for people coming into the career service.

Mr. ROBESON. That is what I am getting at. Do you wait until somebody applies or does somebody get the applicants to apply?

Mr. YOUNG. In my testimony yesterday I outlined what we had done on the Federal service entrance examination where we consolidated over 100 examinations into 1 last fall. This is designed for recruiting college graduates.

Mr. ROBESON. The people at the schools finishing their training?

Mr. YOUNG. On the process of developing that new examination in terms of selling it and recruiting, we either visited ourselves or our representatives in the agencies something over 900 campuses last fall, for example. And since last fall we have received——

Mr. ROBESON. How many people did you recruit?

Mr. YOUNG. We received about 60,000 applications of which now we have about 15,000 as I recall it who are eligible at the present time of these college-graduate level people.

Mr. ROBESON. What happened from then?

Mr. YOUNG. Then it is up to the agencies at that point in terms of filling vacancies to ask for certificates for these registers and recruit from those for their particular positions.

Mr. ROBESON. You have gotten back to the word "recruit."

Mr. YOUNG. They are taken from our register for—this is a general register and they are looking for specific talent and types of talent and capabilities.

Mr. ROBESON. After they have the information how do they actually get the individual to go to work for them?

Mr. YOUNG. They notify the Civil Service Commission as to what the vacancy is, what they look for, we give them a certificate with names off the Civil Service Register and they pick from the certificate.

Mr. ROBESON. They pick the name they want, but how do they actually get the man?

Mr. YOUNG. The man will come in. If he is interested in the job he will come in and have an interview, they talk to him. It is like any normal recruiting process from that point on.

Mr. ROBESON. I do not believe it is very normal. I admit to some experience in that field. Does anybody go see the man or do they wait for him to see them?

Mr. YOUNG. They ask for him to come in.

Mr. ROBESON. Then who does he talk with?

Mr. YOUNG. He will talk to the personnel director, he will talk to the head of that operating division or unit.

Mr. ROBESON. What percentage of them take the jobs?

Mr. YOUNG. I do not think we have any precise figure on it.

Mr. ROBESON. It would vary. The trouble is it is generalizing all over the lot when it is specialized action.

The reason I ask this is because I do not think anybody is getting any people just by getting them to apply and all that and then notifying them that they would like to talk with them and going through that. I think the people get them by sending the right fellow down to talk to the man and sell him. I think it is overemphasized here that these graduates in specialized engineering and all that go primarily where they are offered the most money. I did not do it.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. On the record.

Mr. ROBESON. I think the man who goes to see a boy and talks to him sells him and I just wondered about this Government selling job.

Mr. MACY. On the specialist-type jobs the recruiting has been even more intensive than that described by Chairman Young. Actually the individual boards of examiners at places like Langley Field, that you referred to, are doing exactly the type of thing you described having done yourself. They are going to the campuses spending time there talking to the deans of engineering and to the students and this is a matter of continuing personal contact, not just on the part of the personnel people but on the part of the engineers and technical people themselves. There is a very intensive drive in contacting students in all technical schools. We are not relying on putting a notice up on a bulletin board in a post office and getting people to come ask us for jobs. We are recruiting these skills in an aggressive fashion within the limitations of law and regulations.

Mr. ROBESON. I will agree engineers are the poorest salesmen there are in the world and they better take somebody with them to sell the applicant.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. On the record.

Any other questions?

Mr. TUMULTY. As I gather it, Mr. Chairman, is it your position with respect to H. R. 11040 that there are approximately 285—that is really like lifting a positon. In other words, it is a new title.

Mr. YOUNG. This provides for 285 supergrade jobs specifically for the Department of Defense.

Mr. TUMULTY. Actually, as I gather from listening to you, this is a bill for something immediately needed and not an attempt to solve the problem of recruiting employees. Am I correct in that?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. That is to meet a current situation and current problem in the Government and as far as supergrades are concerned and the scientific and professional jobs, it should meet the present situation and the immediately foreseeable situation.

Now, you can never tell in terms of this scientific era as to what you will get into from one day to the next.

Mr. TUMULTY. As I heard you testify you said in effect what would happen is some people would get promoted and others step in behind them and it might happen that the lower part of the ladder would be sealed off.

Mr. YOUNG. It could be.

Mr. TUMULTY. That would be a rather odd way of solving the recruitment problem by sealing off the place to which you go.

Mr. YOUNG. Maybe the bottom rung of the ladder is one you cannot recruit for, maybe you have to recruit a rung higher. I have no specific example.

Mr. TUMULTY. Are you not really saying this whole structure is inadequate?

Mr. YOUNG. I am not saying that at all. All we are talking about here is——

Mr. TUMULTY. I am not trying to quarrel with you, but I gather that. Apparently this structure does not meet the needs which are so pressing. Certainly, as I listened to you I did not gather the impression—if you say 285 more jobs are needed, that is O. K. with me—but I do not see where that is going to solve any competition with the Soviet in the need for engineers and people of that sort. It seems to me you need a greater program than this to solve that problem.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it is that kind of broader program I was referring to a few minutes ago. It is a national problem.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do we need more jobs and how many do we need?

Mr. YOUNG. We need now——

Mr. TUMULTY. Putting men you already have up one step, I do not think will solve it.

Mr. YOUNG. This will help.

Mr. TUMULTY. What was the total raise in pay involved?

Mr. YOUNG. The cost of the additional——

Mr. TUMULTY. To the individual, the man who fills the new grade. What does it mean to him?

Mr. YOUNG. If he is in a grade 15 now and goes to 16, it is about $1,000 difference. The opening of grade 16 is $12,900.

Mr. TUMULTY. As I gather, you said no one would be attracted necessarily to Government service because he might get $17,500 instead of $15,000.

Mr. YOUNG. It would help in the case of scientists and engineers as it would in any career opportunity. I do not think you can compete with industry. They can buy him away from you.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do you think just the additional thousand will keep him in the Government service?

Mr. YOUNG. I think it will help to retain him; yes, sir.

Mr. TUMULTY. You have no factual basis, do you, for that statement?

Mr. YOUNG. I think Mr. Moss cited various examples where certain of the scientific agencies had testified about increase in pay.

Mr. TUMULTY. I heard Mr. Moss. Do you know; as a matter of fact, have you had any surveys which indicate there are 285 or less people, these new supergrades, if they are not created, will go someplace else? Have you received complaints from department heads which tell you, "We will lose 10 men because they do not get a thousand-dollar raise"?

Mr. YOUNG. We hear that every day, Mr. Tumulty, and these agencies and departments which use these scientific people that we are talking about indicate that salary is a basic factor in their leaving to go to industry and they feel that whether it is a 20- or 50- or 10-percent increase, that any increase would help; and certainly an increase up to let us say 25 percent could be an influential factor in retaining them.

Mr. TUMULTY. There is this factual basis where the salary may very well help but it will not necessarily aid in recruitment. Is that not a separate problem?

Mr. YOUNG. It is a separate problem and will not retain the individual if industry really wants to buy that individual away from Government because we cannot compete on the same basis.

Mr. TUMULTY. As far as you are concerned you feel that these 285 jobs are needed immediately and forthwith?

Mr. YOUNG. I feel that very strongly.

Mr. TUMULTY. No further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

If not, thank you very much, gentlemen. You are excused.

The committee will now go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 11:25 a. m., the committee went into executive session.)

×